

Application No.: 10/728,119

9

Docket No.: 20003-7023

**REMARKS**

Upon approval of the undersigned's request for entry of the present amendment to the specification and identified claims, previously examined claims 1–27 remain pending. These amendments, and comments herein, are respectfully asserted to moot and/or traverse all outstanding rejections and objections to the specification, drawings, and claims as further described below.

*Drawings*

Re: Drawing Objection – Figure 15 does not include 1505 as described in the specification. The specification was amended to amend 1505 to 605, which is shown in Figure 15.

Re: Drawing Objection – Asserted failure of figures to show extractor using air pressure differential and/or electrostatic charge differential. This objection is respectfully requested to be reconsidered. As demonstrated by the Rejection's citation of representative patents, structures for creation of air pressure differentials and electrostatic charge differentials are well-known to persons of ordinary skill in the art. The present invention does not claim improvements in these devices, rather disposition and use of such structures in cooperation with a stripper/extractor element for processing laminar elements of a pad of laminar elements. The stripper/extractor elements are shown and described throughout the specification as originally filed, including incorporation of air pressure differential and electrostatic charge differential generators (among other functions and structures). The undersigned believes that amendment of the figures to incorporate these specific elements would not improve upon the description of the invention and could cause unintended confusion by suggestion or intimation that the stripper/extractors were in some sense limited to these modalities.

*Specification*

Application No.: 10/728,119

10

Docket No.: 20003-7023

Re: Objection for asserted lack of antecedent bases:

Media Supply Path – Moot, claim amended

Control Logic – Moot, claim amended

Voice-to-print – Moot, claim amended

Electrostatic charge differential – Reconsideration is requested: paragraph [66] discusses deposition/provision of opposite charges in conjunction of a discussion of an extractor for separating/fanning individual element of pad elements. It is respectfully asserted that opposite charges product a charge differential sufficient to support this claim limitation.

Re: Objection for inconsistent text associated with reference 1315. Moot, specification amended.

### *Claims*

#### Objections

Re: Claims 2, 3, 5, 11, and 12 – Improper form. Moot, claims amended as appropriate.

#### Rejections

Re: 112, First Paragraph, Claims 1–21

Claim 1 – Media Supply Path. Moot, claim amended

Claim 6 – Air Pressure Differential. Reconsideration is respectfully requested. As noted in the rejection, Figure 20 illustrates separation of laminar

Application No.: 10/728,119

11

Docket No.: 20003-7023

elements by air. Paragraph [64] explains the use of positive and negative air pressure to separate pad elements. As well-known to a person of ordinary skill in the art, Bernoulli and Venturi principles explain a relationship between moving air (fluid) flow and pressure. There are many structures, e.g., airplane wings, that generate air pressure differential from moving air. The representation in Figure 20 of moving air is respectfully asserted to support the claim language.

Claim 7 – Extractor use of electrostatic charge differential – reconsideration is respectfully requested as noted above in the discussion of electrostatic charge differential, for example in paragraph [66].

Claim 18 – Control logic and handwriting recognition – Moot in light of amendments to the claim. The specification is replete with a discussion of the operation and function of the various control system implementations and embodiments.

Re: 112, Second Paragraph, Claims 1–21

Claim 1 – media supply path – Moot in light of the amendments.

Claim 19 – voice-to-print – Moot in light of the amendments.

Re: 102(b) – Saka – Claims 1–5, 11, and 12

Claim 1: Moot in light of the amendments to claim 1. Claim 1, as amended, recites a stripper in cooperation with a pad while a transfer registration system locates a laminar element for image transfer. Elsewhere in the rejection, the rejection equates a user with a stripper function for removing a laminar element. It appears that Saka has a capability for moving inside and outside of the printing system, with the pad inaccessible to the user when the pad is located for printing.

Application No.: 10/728,119

12

Docket No.: 20003-7023

Claims 2 and 3: Moot, at least in light of the amendments to claim 1 affirmatively reciting the transfer registration system including the pad.

Claim 4: Moot, at least in light of the amendment to claim 1.

Claim 5: Moot in light of the amendment to claim 5.

Claim 11: Moot, at least in light of the amendment to claim 1.

Claim 12: Moot in light of the of the amendments to claims 1, 11, and 12.

Re: 102(b) – Yamaguchi (claims 1, 4, and 6): Moot in light of the amendments to claim 1. Yamaguchi does not have a provision for dealing with bound pads, among other limitations.

Re: 102(b) – Fukube (claims 1, 4, and 7): Moot in light of the amendments to claim 1. Fukube does not have a provision for dealing with bound pads, among other limitations.

Re: 102(e) – Ono (claims 1, 4, 8, 9, 13, and 14): Moot in light of the amendments to claim 1. Additionally, Ono fails to teach a contacting element to bow a laminar element to separate it. As disclosed in Ono, air separates the laminar element. It appears that any bowing and contacting occurs after separation by the air.

Re: 102(b) – Mayer (claims 1, 4, and 10): Moot, at least in light of the amendments to claims 1 and 4. Mayer operates on a simple stack of blank paper (unbound).

Application No.: 10/728,119

13

Docket No.: 20003-7023

Re: 102(b) – Oda (claims 1 and 15): Moot in light of the amendments to claim 1. Oda fails to teach or reasonably suggest the limitations and element arrangements recited in amended claim 1.

Re: 102(b) – Yasui (claims 1, 16, and 17): Moot in light of the amendments to claim 1. Yasui fails to teach or reasonably suggest the limitations and element arrangements recited in amended claim 1.

Re: 103(a) – Yasui + Aizawa (claim 18): Moot in light of the amendment to claim 1. In addition, the undersigned respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection's combination of these references. Yasui teaches a desire to precisely position text characters onto a check form by creation of precision templates. The rejection fails to suggest how Aizawa would be combined and used in such a system as Yasui already has an input system. Aizawa teaches its use in a system otherwise lacking an input system – As presented in the English Abstract, the USE is for a TV receiver. It is respectfully asserted that the suggested combination of Yasui and Aizawa would not be desired as handwriting recognition in general is viewed as a less precise input system teaching away from its use in Yasui.

Re: 103(a) – Saka + Young (claims 19, 22, 23, 25, 26 and 27): Moot at least in light of the amendments to claim 1 and claim 22. Further:

Claim 19: The specification as originally filed includes at least two features associated with voice-recognition. Supplying content and supplying directives. The rejection represents that it assumes claim 19 includes the former feature; the undersigned respectfully submits that the claim 19 limitations are more reasonably interpreted to include the latter form. The amendments are respectfully asserted to further emphasize this interpretation. As such, the asserted combination fails to teach or reasonably suggest the claimed combination.

Application No.: 10/728,119

14

Docket No.: 20003-7023

Re: 103(a) – Saka + Shimizu (claims 20-21): Moot at least in light of the amendments to claim 1.

Re: 103(a) – Saka + Kaplan (claims 22 and 24): Moot at least in light of the amendments to claim 22. Further, the undersigned respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection's combination of these references. For example, the rejection asserts that it would be obvious to combine Kaplan with the image transfer apparatus of Saka assertedly for an ease of only needing to speak information to be entered rather than entering the information manually. Saka is a context production system, thus nothing preexists to be selected or identified as taught in Kaplan. The recited claims 22–27 differentiate between different types of voice-recognition functions and implementations and the rejection is not believed to properly differentiate between the recited functions.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: May 12, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Michael E. Woods

Registration No.: 33,466

PATENT LAW OFFICES OF MICHAEL E.  
WOODS

112 Barn Road

Tiburon, California 94920-2602

(415) 388-0830

(415) 388-0860 (Fax)

Attorney For Applicant